

DOCKET NO.: 306045.01 / MSFT-2792
Application No.: 10/720,506
Office Action Dated: May 4, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figure 4. The sheets, which include Figures 1, 2, 3 and 4, replace the original sheets Figures 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Attachment: 4 Replacement Sheets.

REMARKS

The present response accompanies a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Claims 1-22 were rejected in the Office Action dated May 4, 2007. Claims 2, and 8-22 are objected to. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 35 § 101. Claims 1-5, 8-13, and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 35 § 102. Claims 6, 7, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 20 and 22 have been amended. Claims 3, and 5-7 have been canceled. Thus, claims 1, 2, 4, and 8-22 will remain pending in the application after entry of the foregoing claim amendments.

In the Drawings

A typographical error is corrected in Figure 4. Entity 406a is amended to recite “generator” to correspond to the specification. A complete set of replacement drawings, including corrected Figure 4, is submitted herewith.

Claims 2 and 8-22

Typographical errors are corrected in claims 2, 16, 20, and 22. Antecedent basis issues are corrected in claims 8 and 22. No new matter has been added. Applicants request withdrawal of the objections to the claims.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as not being limited to statutory subject matter because the claims appear to lack necessary physical components to constitute a machine. Without prejudice or disclaimer as to the nature of the subject matter disclosed in claims 1-7, claim 1 is hereby amended to recite a computer display. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection, under 35 U.S.C. § 101, of claims 1-7 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-5, 8-13, and 15-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Goodwin, et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,199,195 (Goodwin). While Applicant regards the claims to be patentable over Goodwin in their present form, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 4, 8, 10, and 11 and 22 to overcome the rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a system generating *procedural-oriented output* source code from a functional model comprising “a modeler for defining at least one of a plurality of code elements and a structure of a code block.” In claim 1, as amended, the modeler processes input comprising “a code block of procedural-oriented source code” and generates “a physical representation ... of the at least one code element and structure of the code block.” Claims 4, 8, 10, 11, and 22 have similarly been amended. Support for the amendments can be found in the Applicant’s Specification. (Specification, pg 3, para. 15)

The Advisory Action asserts that Goodwin discloses a “source code block” input to a modeler, and refers to modeling tools “defining data within a database or defining objects and relating these objects to the data within the database” noting that data from the database is interpreted as the claimed source block code. (Advisory Action, para. 3) However, data is not the same as source code, particularly procedural-oriented source code as amended in the claims. Procedural-oriented source code, as distinguished from data, includes instructions that details tasks for a computer to perform.

Thus, Goodwin does not teach or suggest processing an “input comprising a code block of *procedural-oriented source code*” as amended in claim 1, 4, 8, 10, 11, and 22.

Furthermore, the modeler in Goodwin is referred throughout the patent in the context of object-oriented programming. Goodwin, in general, is directed to generating *objects* where the input to the modeler is within an *object framework*. For example, “data” is described in Goodwin as attributes of the object class. (Goodwin, col. 4, ll. 1-2) The modeler in Goodwin models objects or data in object classes, which is a useful tool in object-oriented programming. However, as amended, the claims in the present application are directed to procedural-oriented programming, which is distinguishable from object-oriented programming. Modeling an input of *procedural-oriented* source code is performed differently than modeling an input of *object-oriented* source code (as described in Goodwin). Accordingly, claims 4-6 have been canceled.

Claim 1 has also been amended to incorporate dependent claim 3, reciting “a selector for selecting at least one of a plurality of programming languages in which to generate procedural-oriented output source code from the functional model.” The Final Rejection Office Action cites “...the user options for code to be generated are obtained...” in Goodwin as teaching claim 3, prior to the amendment. However, the code generator in Goodwin “reads the object elements” and “applies a set of known templates ... to the object elements of the unified models to produce a set of source code objects.” (Goodwin, col. 13, ll. 20-27) As well known in the art, unified modeling language is a standardized specification language for object-modeling. The amendment in claim 1 further clarifies that the programming language is used to generate *procedural-oriented output* source code in the claimed system. *Procedural-oriented output source code* generated in claim 1 is distinguishable from the *object-oriented source code objects* generated in Goodwin. (See Goodwin, Abstract, col. 6, ll. 52-59, etc)

In general, Goodwin is directed to generating *objects* within *extensible object frameworks* in the context of object-oriented programming. Thus, Goodwin does not teach or suggest generating procedural-oriented output source code where the inputs to the modeler are *procedural-oriented* source code, and, as amended in claim 1, selecting a programming language to generate *procedural-oriented output* source code.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 8, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Goodwin. As claims 2, and 4 depend from claim 1 and claims 9-21 depend from claim 8, Applicant further respectfully submits that claims 2, 4, and 9-21 patentably define over the references as applied.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6, 7, and 14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,199,195 in the name of Goodwin and further in view of officially noticed computer languages or further in view of U.S. Patent 6,684,385 in the name of Bailey et al.

With respect to claims 6 and 7, the rejection is now moot because Claims 6 and 7 have been canceled. Claim 14 is dependent directly or indirectly from an allowable

DOCKET NO.: 306045.01 / MSFT-2792
Application No.: 10/720,506
Office Action Dated: May 4, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

independent claim, and because the independent claim is allowable for the foregoing reasons, Appilcant submits that Claim 14 is likewise allowable for the same reasons as discussed above.

DOCKET NO.: 306045.01 / MSFT-2792
Application No.: 10/720,506
Office Action Dated: May 4, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

It is requested that the foregoing amendments, arguments, and remarks be entered, and in view thereof, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow this application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: October 31, 2007

/Lori Anne D. Swanson/
Lori Anne D. Swanson
Registration No. 59,048

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439